



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

doubt of, by way of earnest as to what they would get.—You were a bold man if you set Father M—— at defiance after such warnings as them!

Tom.—And yet, John, they call this freedom of election and independence of voters. Did you see the address that the priest's man stuck up on the chapel gate? What was the heading of it?

John.—Why, I think it was—"To the Independent Electors," &c.

Tom.—Just so. But it is a queer kind of independence, to have our windows smashed, our stacks set on fire, afear'd to show our face in the markets or fairs, hunted in this world, and damned in the next, unless we vote as the priest orders; you don't call this freedom and independence, do you, John?

John.—Why, not exactly; but, then, surely the priest must know who is the best man.

Tom.—Why must he? What is the use of parliament giving us a right to vote, if we dare not give it to whom we like? The parliament had better at once have given all the poor people's votes to the priest, if they can ruin a man in this world and send his soul to hell in the next, for exercising his right to vote as he wishes himself.

John.—Well, Tom, there seems some truth in what you say; it does seem very strange that a man should be damned for voting for this man or that.

Tom.—Why, John, to tell the truth, my notion is, that these so-called liberal men are always the greatest tyrants. The priests get men returned that will play their game. It's little such priests care about the souls of their flocks, as they call them, or about their religion either, I'm thinking; it is their own interests they look to; they make the members that they have sent to parliament vote as they please; I hear tell that they are called the Pope's Band, or Priests' Brigade—they get acts passed which seem to give power to us poor people, but it is because they think that they can drive us like a flock of sheep to the hustings to vote as they please.

John.—Well, Tom, there's no denying what you say. Very little, I believe, they do care for us, except for what they make by us; but what can we do? We never could stand the country, if we went against them; they would make it too hot for us.

Tom.—That wouldn't be, John, if every one had the courage to give the priest his mind, the way Ned C—— did. Do you remember what Ned C—— said when the priest told him that he must vote for his candidate?

John.—I do, well. He said he would vote for whom he pleased, that the law gave him his vote to use as he liked, and that if his reverence would mind his religion more, and politics less, it would be better for himself and the country.

Tom.—And what did the priest say?

John.—What could he say, when it was the truth? He turned it off and said that it was his religion that he was asking the vote for; and seeing he could get no good of Ned, he went off to bully some one else.

Tom.—Now, John, let me ask you this question, What is the charge that the priest brings so often against the Protestant religion?

John.—That it depends on Acts of Parliament; or, as he says, it is "the Parliament religion."

Tom.—Well, now, and what does our own depend upon? If you do not vote so as to get a man in, that you do not know, and don't care for, you are to be ruined in this world, and damned in the next; is this religion? Do you call it religion, to make the eternal salvation of a man's soul depend upon giving a vote this way or that? Do not let us talk about the Protestant religion depending upon acts of parliament. No Protestant minister ever said that a man would be damned if he gave his vote to this man or that. Now, John, you have told me what the priest said at the chapel, you have told me that he said that our religion depended upon members of parliament; that men should have their houses in flames in this world and their souls in flames in the next, if they did not vote with him; now, let me tell you what the Scripture-reader said to me the other day. We talk very friendly together, though I call myself a Catholic. I said to him—well! Mr. ——— How will the election go? Well, Tom, he replied, I hardly know; I hope however that our Heavenly Father will so order things that peace may be preserved, and that such measures may be passed as will insure the happiness and welfare of our country; my prayer is—"That God may so order the course of this world by his governance, that his Church and people may be able to serve him in all godly quietness."

"Why," said I, "you seem to care very little about the election."

"No, Tom, you are mistaken," says he, "I care about everything that may bring happiness or misery to our country; and I hope the providence of God may so order it, that those who are sent to parliament may legislate for the honour and happiness of our Sovereign and our country."

"I wish, Mr. ———," said I, "that our priest took things as quietly; he says that our religion depends upon the election and the parliament."

At that he smiled and said—"And I begin to think he's right, Tom. The religion of the Church of Rome is

the religion 'of this world.'—John xviii. 36. It seems it must be maintained by violence, falsehood, fire, and sword. The priests feel this, and therefore they are stirring themselves so in this election. The weapons of the Church of Rome seem to be curses, threats, sticks and stones. The weapons of our religion are the truths and arguments of Scripture.—2 Cor. x. 4. Our religion—that is, the religion of the Gospel—is not "of this world." It does not depend upon such things as an election. It does not depend upon Acts of Parliament. It depends upon the Gospel of Christ, and therefore we can afford to be more quiet on such occasions. But as you have said so much of the election that the priests are so violent about, I will tell you of one kind of election that I feel very anxious about. The election which the priest seeks to carry will soon be over, and priests, candidates, and voters will soon be removed to another world, to give an account of all they have done in this. But the election which I am so anxious about, is one which our religion does really depend upon."

"Pray, Mr. ———," said I, "what election is that?"

"It is, Tom, the 'election of God.' God sent his only, beloved Son into the world that men might be saved; my business is to proclaim this blessed truth, to persuade men to embrace the Gospel. I cannot make them do so, that is out of my power—God alone can do that; God, the Holy Ghost, can alone lead men's hearts to embrace the Gospel. 'No man can come to the Son except the Father draw him.'—John vi. 44. To elect is to choose, and the Father hath chosen those whom he leads by his spirit to believe on his beloved Son, that they may be saved. This is the election on which real happiness in this world and in the next depends. My business is to try and persuade men to embrace the offer of God's mercy in Christ. If I succeed in this, and that I see them living by the rule of the Gospel, loving God and man—bringing forth the fruits of righteousness, which are by Jesus Christ, to the praise and glory of God—then I hope I have evidence that God hath chosen them unto eternal life. When I see a man giving evidence of a 'work of faith, and labour of love, and patience of hope in our Lord Jesus Christ, in the sight of God and our Father' (1 Thess. i. 3-4), then I can say, as St. Paul does, that 'I know his election of God,' because the Gospel has come to such 'not in word only, but in power, and in the Holy Ghost.'; This, Tom, is the election that I feel interested about. Have you any interest in this election?"

"I do not know, sir," said I "I never so much as heard of it before. It is little that the priests care about this sort of election; but I see its more concern to us than elections for the county."

"Yes, Tom, it is of very great importance," said he. "It is all very well to revile the Protestant religion; but I would ask you, as a sensible man, to tell me, which religion seems to you to be most according to truth, and most agreeable to the character of a Holy God? The religion which dependant upon a vote for a member of parliament; the religion that would send a man to hell if he did not vote as his priest wished; or the religion which, while it would thankfully accept the outward peace which good government gives, declares that its business is to lead souls to God, to fit them for heaven, and to labour to produce in them that faith and those good works which give good evidence that they have the 'election of God.' Which election do you think concerns the honour of Christ and the safety of our souls the most—the election for the county or the election of God? And which do you find the priests of the Church of Rome most anxious about?"

Mr. ——— and I then parted; but, to tell you the truth, John, I could not get what he said out of my head. I think there is a deal in it, and don't know what to think of our religion. There is so much violence, lying, threatening, and cursing, that it does not seem like the religion of the Lord Jesus, which proclaimed—"Glory to God in the highest, on earth peace, good will towards men." I really do not know what to think; what do you say, John?

John.—Why, Tom, I say nothing, but I have my thoughts about it as well as you; and so they parted.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

We have received Mr. Aylmer's letter, which shall be inserted in our next.

All letters to be addressed to the Editor, 9, Upper Sackville-st.

No anonymous letter can be attended to. Whatever is sent for insertion must be authenticated by the name and address of the writer, not necessarily for publication, but as a guarantee for his good faith.

Subscriptions are earnestly solicited, which our friends will observe are payable in advance. The amount may be forwarded either in postage stamps or a post-office order, payable to Mr. Wm. Curry, Upper Sackville-street, Dublin.

Contributors of £1 per annum will be furnished with six copies, any of which will be forwarded, as directed, to nominees of the subscriber. Any one receiving any number of the journal which has not been paid for or ordered by himself, will not be charged for it, and may assume that it has been paid for by a subscriber.

The Catholic Layman.

DUBLIN, AUGUST, 1852.

THE IRISH ELECTIONS.

It is not our habit to engage in party politics, and it is not our intention to do so now. Advocates as we are of civil and religious liberty in the truest sense, we disclaim all desire to influence other men's actions, except by setting before them principles which they themselves may think fit to govern their conduct.

We write of the late elections in Ireland, not for the purpose of personal or individual censure, but to induce our brother Catholic laymen calmly to consider the principles on which many of those elections have been conducted, and to judge for themselves whether those principles be suitable for a free state and a Christian people. It is the principles we seek to discuss, and we use the facts only to show what the principles are.

The most striking fact in the Irish elections has been the manner in which the Roman Catholic clergy have interposed to control the choice of the electors. We feel that little proof of the fact is required, as most of our readers must be well aware of it from their own observations.

The Roman Catholic clergy have claimed for themselves the right of choosing the representatives, wherever they had any chance of being able to effect it by any means.

It would be ridiculous to give long proofs of so notorious a fact; so we give but a few—"Meath, in her priesthood, sat in calm council, and selected as her representative," &c. (letter of the Rev. Mr. Kelsh, a priest in Meath—*Tablet Newspaper*, July 31). Here it was the priests only who met to choose the representative; and "Meath" is said to have made the choice, as if it were the exclusive right of the priests to act for Meath, the laity having nothing to do but to obey, and, therefore, not being consulted in the matter. And accordingly we find Mr. Lucas and Mr. Corbally both acknowledging the power by which they were returned in the following words:—

"For sending him (Mr. Lucas) to parliament the bishop and clergy of Meath deserve and enjoy the gratitude of the Catholics of the empire."—*Tablet*, August 7.

"The number of votes recorded in his (Mr. Corbally's) favour amounted nearly to two thousand, and for those he was indebted to the bishop and the Catholic clergy. . . . If it had not been for the clergy he would have been beaten."—Speech at Meath election, *Tablet*, July 31.

Take again the great County of Tipperary—

"It is well known that it is the priests of Tipperary, and the priests alone, who can and will gain a triumph over the enemies of freedom, in this great county, at the coming election."—*Tablet*, July 10.

And Archbishop McHale, at the Galway election, expressly recognises and approves of it—

"No doubt the clergy of Ireland are very much responsible for their share in the result of the contests now waging through the land."—*Tablet*, July 24.

The means taken to carry into effect such elections are equally notorious. The priests having made their choice, were prepared to maintain that their choice was the choice of God, and that it was an offence against God to vote against their men.

We give one or two instances at random of the manner in which the priests have used their spiritual powers to force their candidates on electors.

An influential priest at Tralee is reported to have said:—

"Let me suppose one of THESE WRETCHES (those who would not vote as he bid them) prostrated by sickness—suppose the hand of death heavy upon him, and

a messenger come to me to attend him in his dying moments. If there were no other priest in the way I would be bound to go. I dare not refuse to attend. But I confess I would be sorry in my heart to be called on to attend the death-bed of such a being. . . . I could have no hope of converting a heart so hardened, so lost to every sense of duty and religion, as to vote in support of those who would trample on the Lord of Hosts."

We have no doubt that Father M—— would attend, with the usual alacrity of a Christian minister, at the death of any person guilty of *any other sin*, and would not be without hope of converting him. Such dreadful sentences are reserved for political disobedience to the priests at elections.

In the town of Westport the following placard was carried in a procession at which many priests were present:—

"Whoever votes for a supporter of Lord Derby's government votes for the massacre of his countrymen, the violation of the house of God, AND THE POLLUTION OF THE BODY AND BLOOD OF HIS REDEEMER."

We should not quote such placards as the work of priests, were they not countenanced by the highest authority. At the Galway election Archbishop M'Hale spoke as follows:—

"If you wish that your chapels should be wrecked, that your priests should be flung into prison, that THE GOD OF HEAVEN, under the form of bread and wine, should be exposed to blasphemous insult, as he was on a late occasion, you will support Lord Derby's government."

Of course all this refers to the party fight at Stockport. Lord Derby is accused of getting up that fight. It is an old and a good rule, that when any persons are suspected of having wilfully contrived a wicked action, it should be considered *who could profit by that act, and who has taken advantage of it*. Those are the persons most likely to have instigated it; and not the persons whose interests it was most likely to injure. Now, mark this; scarcely a priest who spoke at the late elections but brought forward this party fight as the most effectual thing to support his cause. Not one supporter of Lord Derby's government did so. We challenge attention to this. Every one said that this occurrence was the *most injurious thing that could have happened* for Lord Derby—that it was just the thing to give a handle to his enemies, and to do him no good. By every rule of common sense, if any one was to be suspected of getting it up, or instigating it, it was those who have been so industrious in using it as their chief instrument in carrying out their views at the elections. For ourselves, we think the angry passions of ignorant men are the proper explanation of such scenes; and we make no doubt that the guilty on both sides will be impartially punished by the law. In the meantime the occurrence has been made use of by the priests as a handle for putting forward all their spiritual power for controlling men's political conduct.

"For such a one and God;" or, "for such another and the devil," were cries too well known at these elections to need our giving instances here. Nor can any one doubt by whom these cries were raised.

But it was not spiritual terrors alone which the priests sought to make use of. The priest above referred to also said at Tralee—

"If there be a Catholic elector in this borough, who will dare to go forward and register his vote for the enemy, pass him by with scorn and contempt. Let him fester in his corruption. . . . Assemble in a body to-morrow, go to those unfortunate wretches, and make them acquainted with the consequences of their guilt."

Our readers need not be told that the "consequences" which a Roman Catholic elector would be led to expect from a visit of an infuriated rabble, thus urged on by a priest, would be gross insult, personal danger, loss of business, or employment, or livelihood. An election mob is not sent to a man's dwelling to preach to him, but to put him in terror of his life and property. We might easily multiply instances of this, but

let the following description of the duties of a priest at the elections suffice. It is taken from a letter published by Mr. Lucas in the *Tablet* of July 10, page 437, column 3; and no one knows better the duties of a priest, on such occasions, than Mr. Lucas, the member for Meath:—

"The priest will have not only to exhort, and entreat, and command his people to vote for the popular candidates, but he must bring the voters together, and go with them to the polling places, and watch over them at the tally-rooms like a sentinel (why not 'collar them like a bailiff?') . . . The priest must be THE GUTTER AGENT!"

We should hardly believe this either if we did not find it in the *Tablet*. But without this they could not have succeeded.

Our readers are no doubt familiar with the odious cry of "Orange Catholic," which, in many places, has been set agoing by the priests themselves. It is no light thing in Ireland to be held up to the people as a traitor of the vilest description. Such a cry is more likely to put a man in fear of his life, than to convince his conscience.

On the *means* which have been thus used, we have but one observation to make here. If the priests *believed* that the Roman Catholic laity were really willing to be guided by them, the priests would never use such arguments as these. To those who were ready to be guided by priestly advice at elections, the priests would give *advice only*, and would give it in the most agreeable manner. When a priest uses *spiritual terror* to make electors vote as he wishes, that priest feels and knows that *nothing less* than spiritual terrors will make the elector vote in the way required. When a priest calls in the aid of a mob, and uses the fear of insult and ruin to make men vote as he wishes, then that priest knows that *even his spiritual terrors* will not be enough. Let those who have suffered under this treatment take comfort from this. Priests have used such weapons only from a despairing feeling of their own decaying influence and power. The extent to which the priests have used such weapons, shows how many of the Roman Catholic laity are ready to assert their political freedom. Such weapons may obtain a seeming victory for a time, but in reality they hasten the advance of freedom.

The extent to which the priests have endeavoured to be masters of this election, may be partly judged of from the number of cases in which priests have come forward on the hustings as proposers or seconders of candidates. The following list may give some idea of it:—

List of Roman Catholic Priests, proposers, seconders, or CANDIDATES (!) at the late elections.

Rev. Dr. Walsh	... Carlow Borough.
Rev. P. Daly	... Galway Borough.
Very Rev. Dr. Burke	... Clonmel Borough.
Rev. Mr. Corcoran	... Cork County.
Rev. D. O'Rafferty	... King's County.
Rev. Wm. O'Malley	... Tipperary County.
Rev. D. Burke	... Waterford County.
Rev. J. Morris	... Leitrim County.
Rev. Mr. Laffan	... Carlow County.
Rev. Mr. Flynn	... Meath County.
Very Rev. Dean Dawson	... Queen's County.
Rev. Mr. Lalor	... Mayo.
Rev. Mr. Kelly	... Limerick County.
Rev. Mr. Power	... Westmeath County.
Rev. Mr. Ennis	... Wexford County.
Rev. Mr. Fitzpatrick	... Galway County.
Very Rev. Dean Burke	... Clare County.
Archdeacon M'Hale	... Monaghan County.
Rev. Mr. Egan	... Kilkenny County.
Rev. Mr. Hickey	
Archdeacon Fitzgerald	
Rev. Mr. M'Quaid	
Rev. Mr. Dowling	
Rev. Mr. Coghlan	
Rev. J. Redmond	
Rev. P. Devereux	
Rev. J. Macklin	
Rev. Wm. Lynch	
Rev. Mr. M'Quaid	
Rev. P. Brennan	
Rev. M. Keefe	
Rev. Mr. Aylward	

Rev. J. Braham	... Limerick City.
Rev. E. M'Gaver	... Longford County.
Rev. D. Noone	... Sligo County.
Rev. Mr. Bannon	... Louth County.
Rev. Mr. Loughran	... New Ross.
Rev. Mr. Trainor	... Athlone.
Rev. Pat Crane	... Dundalk.
Rev. Thomas Doyle	... Kerry County.
Rev. J. Crane	... Cork City.
Rev. John Reilly	
Rev. Dr. Kieran	
Rev. Dr. M'Ennery	
Rev. John Falvey	

And that the highest sanction should not be wanting, Archbishop M'Hale himself proposed candidates at two county elections—Galway and Mayo. This list is taken from the *Tablet* newspaper. It is not complete, because in uncontested elections the proposers and seconders are often not recorded; and in several such cases priests did probably come forward. Yet it shows *forty-seven* instances; and if complete, the number would probably much exceed *fifty*. We believe this could not be paralleled in the history of any former election in Ireland. The number of priests who were speakers at election meetings is past calculation. In Meath, for instance, the priests seem to have been the only persons who had the privilege of speaking on such occasions. No respectable Roman Catholic in the county would do the work.

Of the exertions of the priests in the polling booths, on the roads, and in the streets, in forcibly dragging electors in the opposite direction to that in which they would have gone, if left to themselves, we need say nothing, as our readers must have seen it themselves.

Where such scenes did not take place at elections, the reason will be found rather in the circumstances of the place than in the character of the men. Whenever it *could be attempted* it *has been attempted*, and in every case to the full extent to which it could safely be carried; wherever it was *not tried*, it was evidently impossible to try it. The writer of this has, with regret, seen those whom he was accustomed to look on as the most respectable members of the priesthood, taking as violent a part as the most violent.

The number of Englishmen whom the priests have returned for Ireland (and that, too, in places where Irish Roman Catholics of distinguished sincerity and ability sought the representation), is a fact which should not be overlooked. Observe the following instance from the speech of Dr. Kieran, at the Dundalk election (*Tablet*, July 17, p. 463, col. 3):—

"The very reverend gentleman then referred to the candidature of Mr. Gartlan, upon whose talents and character he passed a high eulogy, and appealed to him to retire and make way for Mr. Bowyer."

And for what reason?

"That gentleman," continued Dr. Kieran, "although an Englishman, had been recommended by the highest ecclesiastical authority in England and Ireland."

Meaning, of course, the English Cardinal Wiseman. This was the sole ground. Mr. Bowyer was first appointed member for Dundalk by Cardinal Wiseman, and Mr. Gartlan, the Irish solicitor, who defended O'Connell in the state trials, although he had publicly pledged himself to go to the poll in spite of all opposition, dared not do so before an *Irish* constituency, because the *English* Cardinal had forbidden it!!

We have often warned the laity that Drs. Cullen and Wiseman have instructions from the Pope to use every means to break down the spirit of Irish nationality, and bring it into total subjection to Rome; and here we have a striking proof of the truth of our warning.

On the whole, who can fail to see that a desperate effort is being made, on the part of the priesthood, to choose the representation of Ireland themselves, and to leave nothing but obedience and submission to the laity?

And for what purpose is this done? Some men seek to be returned to parliament from mere

vanity. *It is not from this motive* that the priests seek to return our members: they are too wise, and too well directed by their superiors, to pay such a price as this election has cost them for the mere vanity of showing their influence.

Only consider what it has cost them—in Meath, for instance. It is well known that the Roman Catholic Bishop of Meath, in speaking of the duty of electors, at a public dinner, in the town of Oldcastle, was told by a Roman Catholic gentleman, of station and influence, “that if that was the gospel that his lordship preached, the sooner they heard another gospel the better.” And when that gentleman retired from the table, several others rose up, and followed him. It is well known that another Roman Catholic gentleman has said, that the expression “surpliced ruffians” was coming true! It is well known that, in the chapel of Athboy, on Sunday, July 24th, when the priest preached on those who dared to vote for Grattan, five or six Roman Catholics, distinguished for their birth, their intelligence, or their influence, rose up, and left the chapel, and have said that they would not return to it. It is well known that *all* the influential Roman Catholics of Meath, and a great body of the middle class, are indignant and disgusted at the interference of the priests at that election.

This was too high a price to pay for mere vanity, and it was not for mere vanity that it was incurred. The state of Europe tells the object: the priesthood are everywhere grasping at political power, as their last resource. The Pope is kept upon his throne by foreign politics and foreign bayonets, and the Jesuits are everywhere striving for political power. It is so in Ireland, too. If the priesthood can return their own members, they become a political power in the country; and they feel that in their present critical position, the most desperate efforts must be made, the greatest dangers must be risked, to accomplish this last hope against an impending fall.

This is the great fact of the Irish elections, and we ask “Catholic laymen” to consider the principle it involves.

On that night when our Blessed Lord was about to found his kingdom in his own blood, he had occasion to correct his Apostles, for coveting for themselves that kind of power which political rulers possess; and he said to them—“The kings of the Gentiles lord it over them; and they that have power over them are called beneficent, but you not so.”—Luke xxii. 25, Douay Bible. They were not to covet nor to possess the power of temporal or political rulers.

That same night when Pilate asked him about his kingdom, he answered—“My kingdom is not of this world; if my kingdom were of this world, my servants would certainly strive, that I should not be delivered to the Jews, but now my kingdom is not from hence.”—John xviii. 36. Political power is the power of the sword; because it rests upon the sword. In every country there are men who would overthrow the existing government of that country if they could, or if they dared. Any government that is not prepared to defend itself against such men by force will quickly perish. We happily do not see this so plain in England; but if we look over Europe, we see plainly that all political power depends on the sword for its support. But our Saviour says, there was to be nothing of the kind in his kingdom, because **HIS KINGDOM IS NOT OF THIS WORLD.** All political power exercised by Christ's ministers in that capacity, and by that title, is, therefore, at variance with the essential nature of Christ's kingdom upon earth.

We do not forget that clergymen are citizens too; and *in that capacity* may lawfully exercise their fair share of political power. Had the priests confined themselves to voting as electors

—had they confined themselves to using such persuasion with other electors as their superior intelligence might give them, we should not have had one word to say against it. But when they claim to have a right *in the character of priests of Christ, by that title, and in that capacity*, to overrule and govern the political conduct and political privileges of other men, then we say that, claiming to be priests of Christ, they are subverting the kingdom of Christ; they are confounding, and destroying, and denying its true and essential character; they are building up for themselves a kingdom of this world, which is not the kingdom of Christ; they thrust him from his kingly throne, to rule themselves in baser seats.

These directions of Christ concerning his kingdom may account for a fact which is proved by the experience of the world, however contrary it may be to any expectation which we might otherwise have formed—namely, that political power, in the hands of the ministers of Christ, has ever taken the form of the most oppressive and hopeless of human tyrannies. Men did, not unnaturally, expect that it would be otherwise. The world indulged a hope that they whose passions were regulated by a higher power, whose aims were directed to man's greatest good, whose minds were sanctified by a more immediate inspection of the Most High, would be more fit than any others to have the direction of this world, more likely to prove benefactors of mankind, than any others who could exercise authority upon them. And the expectation, perhaps, was natural. Yet it has ever been disappointed. We do not speak now only of the priests of Rome; we speak of the Primitive Church in its purest days, of the reformed Churches, of all Protestant sects, heretical or not, and we affirm, that the possession of political power, of the powers of this world, by any of them, has ever shown a constant tendency to degenerate rapidly into the worst form of tyranny.

We glory in the conviction that the Gospel has conferred the greatest political benefits on mankind. Even in our own days, we know that it has shown its mighty power in humanizing political institutions: it has abolished slavery in most Christian countries, and has well nigh abolished the slave trade from the face of the earth. But these things have ever been done when Christ's ministers assumed no political or earthly power to themselves.

Wherever they have sought to become what Christ warned them that they should not be—whenever they have attempted to turn his kingdom into a kingdom of this world, they have proved anything but benefactors to mankind.

We need look no farther for an instance than to Rome itself. There the experiment of Christ's ministers assuming to themselves the temporal and political power has had the fullest and the fairest trial, and the clearest result. The history of Rome, for centuries, has been, and now is at this day, one long-continued contest of tyranny on the one hand and rebellion on the other, which we ourselves have seen break out into the flames of civil war, and which we now see compressed by the most hateful tyranny that can oppress a nation—her own rulers supported by foreign bayonets, and resting upon them alone. But the Papal government, being infallible, is beyond repentance; and instead of now providing a free government for her Roman subjects, is seeking to grasp in her own hand the political rule of all other countries; and hence the scenes that we have witnessed at our Irish elections.

There is no remedy for this, but that our countrymen should learn that Christ declared that his ministers should not be so—that his kingdom should not be of this world. Let us learn to believe in the kingdom of Christ, not merely as it shall be hereafter in the world to

come, but as it now is in this present world. It is a kingdom that waxes strong, and confers blessings on man, by using no human powers, but trusting solely upon him who was its founder, and who alone can be its keeper and defence. But let it once stretch forth the arm of flesh for its own defence, and its inherent power is departed with its real character; then none but Christ himself can heal the wounds that arm of flesh inflicts; and we learn to curse the hand that dares to mix up what God has made distinct and separate.

In the spread of this true knowledge of the nature of Christ's kingdom upon earth, we place our only hope for the safety of our earthly kingdom. In proportion as the people learn this, the priests will have to acknowledge and submit to it in their conduct.

WE reprint the following able letter from the *Meath Herald*, as it seems to be written with a desire to avoid hurting the feelings of Roman Catholics, who are guiltless in the matter. We shall, of course, publish the answer when it appears.

TO THE RIGHT REVEREND DR. CANTWELL.

RIGHT REVEREND SIR—If a general election be often a time of passion and folly, it is often succeeded by a time of reflection and regret.

I have waited until the time of passion may be over, and the time of reflection come, to address you on an important question respecting the teaching of your church, that naturally arises out of the late election for Meath, and which now forces itself upon our notice.

It is not my intention to trouble you on the political view of the late election. Your own reflection, now that the heat of the contest is over, may lead you to doubt whether your victory be worth what it has cost.

It is true, the county of Meath is made for the present a close borough, to which you can nominate whom you please, however flagrantly your nominee may misrepresent the feelings of the county. Yet even such a power may be purchased too dearly.

If you reflect upon the feelings you have called forth in the minds of all the leading Roman Catholics of this county—Prestons, Barnewalls, Husseys, Farrells, Cruises, Plunketts, Delany's, and a whole host of respectable Roman Catholic electors of the middle class—you may well say, “One more such victory, and I shall be undone!”

If you consider the lesson you have given to Protestants, that no services rendered to your church and cause can secure the gratitude of yourself and your clergy,

if you consider how you have divorced the cause of your church from all association with the names that shed a lustre upon Irish history,

if you consider what a wound you have inflicted upon the just national feelings of Irishmen in your selection of a nominee to be forced upon this county,

if you consider the effect which the conduct of yourself and your brethren for the last two years has had upon English Roman Catholics, in making the Emancipation Act a nullity in England, Scotland and Wales (from all which but one Roman Catholic has been returned), thus depriving them of their fair and just share in the representation of the country,

if, I say, you consider all this, in a time of solemn reflection, you may well doubt whether you have not paid too high a price for the privilege of returning, as member for Meath, a man who will be a mere cypher in parliament, powerless to redress the real grievances of the country, because no possible British minister will dare to accept his support—powerless to advance even the interests of your church, because his very presence in parliament will be the most fatal argument against it.

If you had witnessed the scenes that passed in Kells at this election—if you had seen the filthy and disgusting insults to which all respectable Roman Catholic voters were subjected—if you had seen the filthy treatment bestowed at his own door, on that Roman Catholic in Kells whose charity and exertions for our poor have been most admirable (Mr. Flood's political opinions and mine are sufficiently different to make this just testimony to his worth above all suspicion)—you would tremble to think how nearly the violation of political gratitude is connected with the extinction of all private gratitude, all social virtue, all sense of civil liberty, everything that makes a people worthy of respect or admiration.

If you had seen your priests, some acting as check clerks in public polling booths, some like constables or bailiffs in the streets, seizing by the collar Roman Catholic voters at the door of the tally room which they wished to enter, and dragging them with violence through the street to the tally room which they wished